

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of JASMINE HARDY and DILLAN  
LANDRUM, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANGELA CLEMONS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

STEVE LANDRUM and STEPHEN HARDY,

Respondents.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
December 4, 2007

No. 277827  
Berrien Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 04-000141-NA

Before: Schuette, P.J., and Borrello and Gleicher, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). For the reasons set forth in this opinion, we affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The evidence showed that respondent-appellant complied with services during the first few months of this proceeding and the children were returned to her six months after their initial removal. However, after counseling and family reunification services closed, respondent-appellant relapsed into substance abuse, remained unable to properly supervise and discipline the children, allowed the home environment to deteriorate, was unable to effectively budget her resources, and did not resume counseling on a consistent basis to help her cope with her mental health issues. The children were removed and, despite completion of two subsequent inpatient substance abuse programs, respondent-appellant did not participate in outpatient aftercare or submit random screens. Twenty-eight months after the proceeding had commenced, respondent-appellant had not

rectified the conditions leading to adjudication or become able to provide proper care for the children. Given the length of the proceeding, the trial court did not err in finding that she would be unable to do so within a reasonable time.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly contrary to the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The children, ages eight and four, would be saddened by termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights, but the continual instability of removal, return, and re-removal caused by respondent-appellant's inconsistent efforts had caused the children emotional harm. Her inability to effectuate long-term change showed that reunification was not in their best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Bill Schuette

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello

/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher